DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 574 EA 026 162

AUTHOR Gosetti, Penny Poplin; Rusch, Edith A.
TITLE Diversity and Equity in Educational Administration: Missing in Theory and in Action.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Diversity (Institutional); *Educational Administration; Elitism; *Equal Education; *Feminism; Higher Education; *Leadership; Power Structure; Social Stratification

ABSTRACT

This paper argues that the texts, conversations, writings, and professional activities that construct our understanding of leadership come from an embedded, privileged perspective that has largely ignored issues of status, gender, and race. This perspective insidiously perpetuates a view of leadership that discourages diversity and equity. Two different lenses, or perspectives, are used to challenge the embedded assumptions and norms of educational leadership--feminism and privilege. A critique of current literature on educational leadership reviewed the following sources: (1) textbooks used in educational leadership programs; (2) texts for professors of educational leadership programs; (3) a leadership knowledge and skill base from the National Policy Board for Educational Administration; and (4) selected professional journals. The data illustrate the lack of discussion about diversity and equity that occurs throughout the education and professional development of school leaders. To achieve a balanced education about leadership that constructs an inner eye capable of seeing hidden assumptions about leading, the rethinking of this concept must include more diverse examples of leaders and the work of people from many perspectives. The study of leadership must include a multiplicity of perspectives in order to understand how the deeply embedded assumptions of privilege constrain the conversations about diversity and equity. One table is included. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E Rusch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 374 574

DIVERSITY AND EQUITY IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION: MISSING IN THEORY AND IN ACTION

Penny Poplin Gosetti
Educational Policy and Managment
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403
503-591-0729

Edith A. Rusch
Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Leadership
University of Toledo
Toledo, OH 43606

419-537-2095 (voice)
419-537-7719 (FAX)
Internet: Fac4177@UofT01.UTOLEDO.EDU

Presented at the 1994 Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, LA

EA 026 162

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DIVERSITY AND EQUITY IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP: MISSING IN THEORY AND IN ACTION

Penny Poplin Gosetti & Edith A. Rusch
(Joint authors)

> . . . what counts as knowledge is closely related to the interests and power of social groups. What counts as knowledge in differing groups is different but what counts as knowledge in schools and formal education systems is determined largely by the interests of the powerful. Richard Bates

Invisibility. Silence. Inequality. Oppression. Missing viewpoints and perspectives. Contradictions. The words are lost in the empty space, the disparity of the thought. These words describe reality for educational leaders who struggle to integrate new perspectives of gender, race, and class in organizations. These words also describe a reality for students of leadership who cannot locate themselves in the discourse and quickly learn that privileged perspectives marginalize or exclude them, not only from the conversation, but potentially from equal opportunities to lead.

In this paper we argue that the texts, conversations, writings, and professional activities that construct our knowing and understanding of leadership come from an embedded privileged perspective which has largely ignored issues of status, gender, and race and insidiously perpetuates a view of leadership that discourages diversity and equity.[1] In his earliest writing on democracy and education, Dewey warned us that a society that does not want to fall victim to the inequities of stratification and separate classes:

> must see to it that all its members are educated to personal initiative and adaptability. Otherwise, they will be overwhelmed by the changes in which they are caught and whose significance or connections they do not perceive. The results will be a confusion in which a few will appropriate to themselves the results of the blind and externally directed activities of others. (1916, p. 88)

He wrote about the interconnectedness of schooling and society, suggesting that, as a society, we are profoundly affected by how and what we learn and teach. We contend that many people in positions of leadership today lack the habits of mind that contribute to achieving the democratic society that Dewey described.

---

[1] Earlier versions of this perspective are found in Gosetti, 1992; Rusch, Gosetti, & Mohoric, 1991; and Rusch, 1991.

Furthermore, we assert that the privileged truths of leadership create practice and conversely the privileged practice of leadership creates new truth. Ferguson (1984) describes this as "language having people", noting that our "participation in speech consists in joining an already existent flow of activity rather than initiating new activity" (p. 60). Going beyond Ferguson, we contend that the construction of leadership is so immersed in privileged truths that there is limited opportunity for multiple perspectives to emerge and change the social realities that foster marginalization and inequality.

Challenging ideas and assumptions about leadership is a difficult task because all of our individual and shared notions and ideas of leadership are not clearly visible to us. This paper proposes and applies new tools to enhance clarity of vison so that we might see more clearly what is initally hidden. To critically examine the privileged assumptions embedded in the learning and praxis of leadership we first introduce concepts of embeddedness, multiple lenses, and privilege as tools to enhance our vision of leadership. Second, we apply these concepts to current educational leadership literature as one example of how difficult it can be to see issues until we look at them from more than one perspective. The application of these concepts also highlights how easy it is to see bias when we modify our view with new perspectives.

Educational Theory: Naming the Silence

Challenging the privileged ideas and assumptions about diversity and equity which are embedded in the learning and practice of leadership is essential to developing new perspectives and to changing the social realities that foster marginalization. To do this, we must first recognize the silences which exist in traditional educational theory. The deep embeddedness of privileged ideas and assumptions, however, makes it difficult to recognize the silences. Achieving a clarity of vision which allows the critical examination of mainstream interpretations of traditional educational literature requires an understanding of this concept of embeddedness, a process which develops and perpetuates invisibilities.

Embedded Assumptions

To frame an understanding of the concept of embeddedness we begin with the work of Bourdieu who introduces the notion of "méconnaissance," or misrecognition: "the process whereby power relations are perceived not for what they objectively are but in a form which renders them legitimate in the eyes of the beholder" (1977, p. xiii). Legitimation, he claims, is achieved through a process of concealment where power relations are not disguised but are made invisible through their reconstruction as a "natural"

practice (Bourdieu cited in Mahar, Harker, & Wilkes, 1990). This concealing process of legitimation effectively embeds traditional power relations into everyday learning and practice.

Our understanding of embeddedness is expanded through Bowers' (1984) discussion of how we communicate and internalize cultural values and beliefs. According to Bowers, we each have an "intersubjective self" composed of socially derived assumptions, definitions, and representations which function like a cultural lens. This lens causes us to interpret social reality through the culture's underlying rules and systems of control. Due to the embedded nature of these rules and systems of control, however, we uncritically accept them as correct and natural and reinforce that acceptance through the patterns of communication and behavior we internalize.

As educators, our understanding of how to learn about, teach, and practice leadership is typically determined by the assumptions and values embedded within the dominant leadership culture. Members of that culture develop the theories upon which we base our education and our action. Unfortunately, theories are often visions imposed upon facts; facts which are framed by a culture that influences what we see and how we see it (Gould, 1981). Theory building, as such, focuses on the established paths of societal structures, relying heavily on metaphors drawn from male institutions (Meyer, 1991). The strong cultural influence inherent in these structures and metaphors embeds itself within our theories so deeply that we can no longer see the assumptions and values upon which the theories were originally based.

The universal application of the male experience to our understanding of the world illustrates how, through the internalization of power relations and the process of embedding, we come to unquestioning acceptance of traditional theory and practice. In this process:

> the concerns, interests, and experiences forming 'our' culture are those of men in positions of dominance whose perspectives are built on the silence of women (and of others). As a result the perspectives, concerns, interests of only one sex and one class are represented as general . . . [and] a one-sided standpoint comes to be seen as natural [and] obvious. (Smith, 1987a, p. 19-20)

The danger in allowing these embedded assumptions and values to remain unexamined, however, is that they silently and powerfully continue to shape our reality (Sergiovanni cited in Beck & Murphy, 1993). Their domination in our lives explains why we choose to include or exclude certain elements from stories and discussion, why we continue to hold certain assumptions to be true despite the existence of evidence to the contrary, and why some beliefs, ideas, and recommendations seem obvious and natural

(House, 1983). Women and other outsiders to the dominant leadership culture usually do not become aware of hidden assumptions and value until we fail to follow the deeply embedded programs and agendas of the culture (Bowers, 1984). With different lenses, however, these embedded notions can be critically examined.

Multiple Lenses

As a culture, we are expected to use a common lens to view our world. As a result, we come to know our world through the images that reflect the deeply embedded values and beliefs derived from a dominant culture of white, middle-class, heterosexual males. Other perspectives which do not reflect the norms and standards of this dominant culture become blurred or rendered invisible.

Despite what educational, religious, and other social institutions teach, we do not have to view our world solely through the lens of the dominant culture. The lenses provided by other perspectives help bring into focus the gaps and invisibilities embedded into traditional ways of seeing, thinking, and knowing. The use of these multiple lenses increases our chances of bringing embedded values and assumptions into view. We will use two of these lenses to expose the embedded assumptions and challenge the norms of educational leadership: a lens of feminism and a lens of privilege.

A Feminist Lens

The power of a feminist lens is its ability to focus on the gaps and blank spaces of male-dominant culture, knowledge, and behavior. Through this lens we can locate in the spaces, women and other marginalized groups who have been excluded from the development of knowledge. Although contemporary feminism is democratic in nature--seeking social change by confronting issues of oppression based on gender, race, class, sexuality, and economic status--the clarity of its lens comes from a focus on women and their experiences. By using this lens we are able to move beyond the consideration of women as an "add-on" issue and, instead, critically examine society, culture, and the world from the standpoint of being female.

When we use the standpoint of women to view our world, we begin to discover what Smith (1987a) describes as "fault lines" or those points of rupture which exist between socially organized practice and our daily lived experience. Smith's fault line appeared when she realized her experiences as an academic researcher and a scholar did not match the practices, forms of thought, symbols, images, vocabularies, concepts, frames of reference, or institutionalized structures of relevance in her discipline. She describes her experiences and those of her female colleagues as learning "to work inside a discourse that

we did not have a part in making, that was not 'ours' as women. The discourse expresses, describes, and provides the working concepts and vocabulary for a landscape in which women are strangers" (p. 52). Suggesting that fault lines allow women to recognize that which is problematic, Smith explains:

> The concept of problematic is used here to direct attention to a possible set of questions that may not have been posed or a set of puzzles that do not yet exist in the form of puzzles but are 'latent' in the actualities of the experienced world. . . . The problematic is . . . present in the everyday world as it is given to any of us to live. For the everyday world is neither transparent nor obvious. (p. 91)

Despite its inherent uncomfortableness, the role of stranger, and the experience of the fault line, can give marginalized groups a unique perspective on the questions and puzzles of traditional ideologies and practices. A clearer and more comprehensive vision of social reality is available to people who experience the conflicting identities which often result from living and working in the contradictory locations of both margin and center (Harding, 1991). People who have this uniquely distinct vision of social reality can be described as "outsiders within." According to Collins (1991), an outsider within chooses to refuse full insider status and, as a result, does not internalize the dominant world view nor further the culture in ways prescribed by that culture. The inside status of an outsider within allows her to examine personal and cultural experiences within the context of the dominant culture. The outside status of the outsider within allows her to see the fault lines which exist between the dominant culture and her own experience from the margins. She not only experiences a different reality than the dominant group, but also can provide a different interpretation of that social reality. In addition, when the creative tension between insider and outsider perspectives is maintained, it can help reveal the embedded assumptions of the dominant culture.

When, as outsiders within, we distance ourselves from dominant theories, practices, and modes of thought, we gain a different perspective of the landscape to which many marginalized groups are truly strangers. The lens provided by this location, when focused on traditional educational theories, begins to reveal the deeply embedded assumptions of dominant leadership models and leads us to discover the invisibility of women in theory development. Women's invisibility in theory development, according to Thiele (1987), stems from the marginalizing practices of exclusion, pseudo-inclusion, and alienation. As an active process of disregard, exclusion can take many forms. These forms include decontextualization (creating generalizations from the abstractions of real people, activities and events), universalisms (language which disguises the absence of a culture or group and denies the existence of exceptions), naturalisms (taken for granted

assumptions which no longer require explanation), dualisms ("logically" opposing terms that contain implicit value judgments), and appropriation (the process of reversing women-centered images and symbols for use in male activities). Unlike exclusion which disregards women, pseudo-inclusion contains women in theory but continues to use the male experience as the norm. As a result, women are considered from a marginalized or "special case" perspective. Even when women become the subject of theory, alienation can occur. While the dominant culture points out that women are now the object of analysis in their own right, a feminist lens reveals a reality of distorting women's lives by interpreting their experiences through male categories.

A feminist lens allows us not only to challenge the reality of the dominant culture, but also to propose new realities. Tetreault (1989), for instance, offers a five phase curricular integration process that allows us to critically examine how we think about women in existing educational curricula, as well as envision a curriculum that "interweaves issues of gender with ethnicity, race, and class" (p. 124). In general, current educational systems are oriented to either a male defined curricula or one that adds to the curricula women who perform well with the masculine tradition. In the first instance, the male experience is assumed to be universal and generalizable to all human beings (exclusion); in the second, women are added into the activities, theoretical constructs, and recommendations that originate in the experiences of white privileged men (pseudo-inclusion). Presenting these approaches as phases one and two, Tetreault describes a more desirable, but far less common stage three as a "bifocal curriculum" which examines the differences between men's and women's lives using content, structure, and methods which are often more appropriate to the male experience (alienation). "Women's curriculum," stage four, uses a multidisciplinary approach to examine women's lives from the standpoint of women. while stage five balances gender in the curriculum by recentering knowledge in a way that draws on the experiences and scholarship of men and women equally. It is this phase, according to Tetreault, that will transform our understanding of the social world.

When using Tetreault's analysis of curricula content to examine several educational administration curricula, we found, at best, an "add on" approach to content. Although the curricula included a few classes specifically about women, none of the courses were required. A title which includes the word "women" does not necessarily guarantee a course of study from the perspective of women's lives or experiences, but neither does a title which excludes the word "women" indicate the lack of a woman centered perspective (or any other diverse perspectives). Therefore we examined the syllabi and reading lists from these educational administration curricula to determine if any of the courses included a woman centered perspective (or any other diverse perspective). Our review revealed no

topics related to gender (or any other issues of diversity). More disturbing, however, was the discovery that only 10% of the curricula included articles or books written solely by a woman or by women and that only 1% of these articles were written by women, from the standpoint of women's experience.

The silence is deafening, the fault line immense. Our use of a feminist lens brings us to the realization that gender not only includes the embedded values and beliefs of a dominant patriarchal system but is embedded itself in how we view issues related to leadership theory and practice. The view from this lens challenges us to understand the realities of our social world and to ask difficult questions: What are we telling woman about their past and future experiences as leaders? What embedded ideas about who can lead are we teaching to future educational leaders? What are the underlying values that determine how we prepare educational leaders to deal with issues of equality and equity? Backed by this lens and these questions we now undertake the examination of privileged assumptions about diversity and equity which are embedded in the learning and practice of leadership.

A Lens of Privilege

While the power of a feminist lens is its ability to locate groups who are excluded from the development of knowledge, the power of a privilege lens is its ability to focus on the subtle patterns of advantage and dominance used by the dominant culture to keep excluded groups marginalized. A reading of the current educational and sociological literature on gender, class, and race shows increasing reference to the concept of privilege (Bohmer & Briggs, 1991; Fine & Weis, 1993; Sleeter, 1993) Despite the rising awareness and acknowledgement of privilege and the role it plays in excluding people from opportunities and conversations, however, there remains a marked silence on the subject of privilege in leadership discourse.

To understand the power of privilege and its continual perpetuation we must first consider Lenski's definition of the concept. According to Lenski, privilege, as a function of power, is "the possession or control of a portion of the surplus produced by a society" (1966, p. 45). The different perspectives about how we attain and maintain privilege as presented by Lenski, begin to suggest reasons why silence shrouds the concept of privilege. A radical viewpoint suggests that rights and privileges are acquired through force, fraud, and inheritance. A conservative viewpoint, on the other hand, argues that inequality is a necessary consequence of consensus among all members of society, even among those who are less privileged. Since both of these perspectives clash with society's professed values of equality, democracy, and participation, it is doubtful that the dominant,

privileged culture will either admit to a radical perspective of conscientiously manipulating and controlling others or publicly endorse a conservative perspective of undemocratic principles.

Another perspective on the maintenance of privileged status suggests that there will always be two classes, one that rules and maintains economic privilege and one that is ruled (Mosca cited in Lenski, 1966). In this scenario, the ruling class has at its disposal the knowledge and the resources to be highly organized and, therefore, enjoys great advantage over an unorganized majority. The ruling class assures the maintenance of its privileged status by embedding its privilege in the culture's value and belief systems through the development of theories that justify social inequality. This shrouding of privilege in a cloak of invisibility leads the masses of less privileged to accept their circumstances as natural and right. Occasionally the ruling class will accept talented members of the less privileged class into its ranks. The purpose of this seemingly welcoming action, however, is to drain off potential leadership from the "lower" ranks, who, because they are self-seeking, will accept this invitation as a means of attaining status and privilege.

Lenski and Mosca provide a foundation with which to consider the role privilege plays in excluding and marginalizing groups in leadership theory and practice. However, through a lens of privilege we begin to see that privilege is not simply a benefit related to economic position or status. From a broader perspective, privilege exists as an invisible and frequently taken-for-granted collection of unearned advantages and assets which are conferred by virtue of group membership. These advantages and assets not only give us choices, opportunities, and a degree of control over our own lives that others might not have, but they also grant us dominance and permission to control (Bohmer & Briggs, 1991; McIntosh, 1988).

From this perspective we begin to see that the members of our highly organized, theoretically justified, and occasionally indulgent dominant culture are taught to view their lives as morally neutral, normative, average, and ideal (McIntosh, 1988). As a result, when work is done to benefit outsiders to the dominant culture, it is actually an exhibition of tolerance and the desire to have "them" become more like "us"(McIntosh, 1988). Tolerance itself, therefore, can be an expression of privilege:

> If one is in a position to allow someone else to do something, one is also in a position to keep that person from doing it. To tolerate your speaking is to refrain from exercising the power I have to keep you from speaking. In tolerating you I have done nothing to change the fact that I have more power and authority than you do. And of course, I don't have to listen to what you say. (Spelman, 1988, p. 182)

When we take a lens of privilege and focus it on women who aspire to leadership positions, we see that they are tolerated by a dominant culture which embeds its privileged status in what these women read, learn, write, and practice. Women leaders often find themselves bombarded with advice from books such as The Managerial Woman (Hennig & Jardim, 1977), Games Mother Never Taught You (Harragan, 1977), and Breaking the Glass Ceiling (Morrison, White, & Velsor, 1987) and seminars on dressing for success which describe how women must look and behave in order to succeed as a leader in a man's world. These books and seminars are examples of how embedded cultural values of privilege and justifications of social inequity perpetuate the notion of the leader as the embodiment of all that is male even among women authors. Women's perceptions of leadership accessibility are most certainly affected when they internalize the privileged concepts and terms disguised within the dominant discourse and use them to understand their world.

The silence surrounding privilege keeps "the thinking about equality or equity incomplete, protecting unearned advantage and conferred dominance by making these taboo subjects" (McIntosh, 1988, p. 9). More insidious than a taboo on privilege as a subject for conversation and contemplation, however, is the deeply embedded forms of privilege which members of the dominant group are taught not to see (McIntosh, 1988). When we focus a lens of privilege on our current practices of schooling we discover that we do not train members of the dominant culture to see themselves as privileged and unfairly advantaged (McIntosh, 1988) and, in fact, perpetuate systems of privilege through an educational system which legitimates inequality by assigning individuals to unequal economic positions under the guise of meritocratic mechanisms (Bowles & Gintis, 1977). Despite our belief in the democratic practices of public schools, there exists a dichotomy between those non-privileged people who exist in the margins and struggle to achieve a voice and those people with privilege who increasingly call for an exclusive authoritative voice (Fine & Weis, 1993).

Although a lens of privilege allows us to reveal the subtle and usually invisible ways in which educational policy and practice embeds ideologies of power, privilege, and marginality into our schools, the difficulty in using it is made clear in Anderson's (1990) discussion of "meaning management." According to Anderson, the school administrator's primary role of managing the school's image becomes an administrative function which, by legitimizing the assumptions, values, and norms of the the dominant culture, renders privilege invisible. It is clear that we need to understand not only how administrators manage their school's meaning but also who benefits from the resulting social constructions.

> Unless researchers in the field of educational administration find ways to study the invisible and unobtrusive forms of control that are exercised in schools and school districts, administrative theories that grow out of empirical research - whether quantitative or qualitative - will continue to perpetuate a view of school effectiveness that is unable to address in any significant manner the problems of their underprivileged clients. (p. 39)

By using a lens of privilege to achieve a greater understanding of unearned advantage and conferred dominance we may discover the intersections which exist between different types of oppression thereby providing a link in the study of gender, race, and class (Bohmer, 1989). In the meantime, however, feelings of confusion and discomfort prevail when the subject of privilege is introduced as a discussion topic. Although conversations and interviews about privilege may be easily engaged in, we have observed that it is difficult for people to acknowledge their own privilege. The observation of this discomfort leads us to think that not only have we not asked all the questions about diversity and equity, but the values, beliefs, and assumptions embedded in our current framework prevent us from seeing the ineffectiveness of our questions to address the fundamental values of diversity and equity.

Theory and Praxis of Educational Leadership

The challenge we face when we confront the ramifications of privilege is highlighted by Cherryholmes (1988),who suggests that in order for marginalized people to have voice everyone needs to rethink what they say and do:

> Rethinking may rejuvenate commitment to conventional discourses-practices or it may lead to something quite different. To avail ourselves of possible choices, however, it is necessary to identify and criticize privileged themes in texts and discourses-practices as well as themes that are silenced. Textual themes and discourses-practices are privileged because, among other things, they're favored by power arrangements and supporting ideological orientations. The exercise of power that has no beginning produces texts and discourses and practices that have no authors. We deal with these by continually reading, interpreting, and criticizing them as we communicate about and evaluate them (p.153).

To explore how privilege is embedded in the lives of educational administrators, we reflected upon our own experiences of learning about leadership during the 35 collective years we worked in public schools and higher education. This personal reflection was a critical exercise for understanding how we experience and perpetuate privilege because as Grumet (1988) points, out if we focus only on the theoretical perspective of these issues,

we literally overlook the privilege and the concomitant influence it has on our own practices as educators.

Educational administrators learn to see and respond to issues of equity and diversity, in large part, through their professional and academic learning experiences. In our own case we found that, despite the increasing number of women and minorities in school leadership positions, feminist theoretical perspectives, multi-ethnic viewpoints, and gendered standpoints were rarely included in our preparation and professional development as school administrators. Discussions of gender, race, and class, as applied to the act of leading, were seldom deliberately addressed in our formal education and certification as school leaders. Bates (1980) argued that these issues are ignored because what really counts as knowledge for educating school leaders is determined by powerful or privileged interests.[2] Those interests, despite a decade of affirmative action laws and civil rights policies, remain predominantly focused on traditional, privileged, and predominantly male perspectives. These perspectives result in actions by school administrators that frequently overlook real social phenomena.

The connection between embedded privileges communicated in educational leadership programs and the resulting privileged praxis of school administrators is illustrated vividly in two studies. In an ethnography of principals in a variety of socio-economic settings, Anderson (1990) found few administrators who were bothered by social inequities around them or who expressed any concerns for basic democratic attitudes like justice and fairness. Using the metaphor of the "construction of the inner eye," (p. 38-39), he concludes that administrators either learn to see or not to see stark inequities around them. Kempner (1991), in his study of professionalism among school leaders, reported similar responses. Few administrators discussed the need for fairness and justice in their schools and those who professed democratic attitudes, "could offer only vague generalizations." When asked about issues of diversity and equity, most administrators responded with "no problem". However, the response varied when the interviewee was a minority. Kempner viewed these responses as an example of the false consciousness that still pervades the educational establishment, but the data also point out how easy it is for privileged perspectives to create blinders about diversity and equity.

These studies by Kempner and Anderson bring forward two key issues: first, a privileged perspective supports silences, the reproduction of silences and "no problem" as acceptable norms. Second, viewing these behaviors and responses through the lens of

---

2 Daniel Griffeths (1991) also expressed concern for this limited perspective, pointing out that despite the increasing number of women in school leadership positions, feminist theories have little influence on the preparation and worklife of school administrators.

privilege highlights the challenge of modifying these embedded values and practices. Richard Quantz, an educator who has given considered thought to this challenge, notes that "those who know only the discourse of the status quo can hardly be expected to challenge the undemocratic practices of the status quo" (Quantz, Rogers, & Dantley, 1991, p. 109). Kempner (1991) drew similar conclusions, speculating that the administrators he interviewed either had minimal awareness or "their education, administrative training and socialization did not offer them the language to communicate a democratic vision for the school in any but the most general of terms" (p. 117)[3]. As Kempner pointed out, the myths that define success for school administrators include male models of discipline and power, business (also male) models of the administrative science, and anti-intellectual models of training that focus on mentoring by skilled and traditional veterans. He also concluded that university programs contribute to the problem, noting that:

> administrators and university programs that accept uncritically the metaphors of business, the military, and athletic contests are subscribing to myths that are antithetical to the ideals of democracy. . . . . We should question how well university certification programs are educating administrators to be democratic leaders who are aware of their moral responsibilities to the citizens they serve. (p. 120)

Both studies accentuate Dewey's call to develop leaders with habits of heart and mind who recognize the role that privilege plays in accepting, empathizing with, and understanding diversity and equity. The studies also highlight the challenges academics face as educators of school leaders: confronting our own assumptions about personal privilege and conducting a deeper examination of the role privilege plays in the schooling of educational administrators.

---

[3] Like other researchers (Murphy & Hallinger, 1987; Hoyle, 1989; Murphy, 1990; 1992), Kempner found that most school administrators expressed little value for university-based course work, particularly courses with theory or philosophy that might challenge value positions. When asked about their leadership education, most practitioners indicated that practical experiences and management tools helped them be better leaders. Noting that most administrators only want to reproduce what they learn from mentors in the field, Kempner concluded that administrators were not interested in reflecting on the values that govern actions they observe and replicate in the field. He reported that these actions were most frequently described using militaristic and athletic metaphors of power, control, and domination

Silences in Leadership Theory

As educational administrators, our worlds are filled with words that define our profession, our culture, indeed our person. Because educational administration has a limited and controversial history as a legitimate profession, the texts that contribute to the social construction of leadership come from many other disciplines such as business, manangement, organizational development, sociology, and social psychology. The uncritical acceptance of theory and praxis from these disciplines results in embedded and privileged symbols, ideas, and methodologies that connect with human experience and emerge as unexamined leadership. By applying the concepts of privilege, multiple lenses, and embedded assumptions to widely used and accepted leadership theories we begin to see differently how the inner eye of educational leaders is constructed.

Transformational Leadership

A potent example of unexamined and deeply embedded assumptions that promote privilege is found in the theory of transformational leadership. Typically credited to the seminal work of James MacGregor Burns (1978), transformational leadership theory advocates flattened hierarchies, team participation, and the maintainance of relationships.[4] When this theory is examined using Thiele's (1987) methods for looking at women's invisibility, some very contradictory perspectives emerge.

The invisibility begins overtly with what Thiele calls the "pseudo-inclusion of women. Burns gives attention to the persistent gendered view about leading, stating that:

> The male bias is reflected in the false conception of leadership as command or control. As leadership comes properly to be seen as a process of leaders engaging and mobilizing the human needs and aspirations of followers, women will be more readily recognized as leaders and men will change their own leadership styles. (p. 50)

Yet, despite his recognition that women may contribute something new to the study of leadership, the fact is that in his 462 page treatise, he makes only brief references to the leadership behaviors of 3 women. Burns also says transformational leaders are concerned with values such as liberty, justice, and equality, yet he concludes that discriminatory

---

[4] Originated in Burn's Pulitzer Prize text, Leadership, transformational leadership is currently found in many academic and popular publications (for examples see Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bennis, 1989; Peters & Austin, 1985; Peters & Waterman, 1982; and Sergiovanni, 1990).

behavior by men is less disturbing to women than their personal sense of outsider status. This perspective reinforces the idea that equality is a woman's problem.

Burns only reinforces this outsider status in the consciousness of women and men by his descriptions of transformational leaders. Calling on the work of Maslow, Erickson, and Piaget, he designs a portrait of the transformational leader as having higher purpose and ethical aspirations, who expects to be concerned with values such as liberty, justice, and equality. Yet, Burns makes few references to equality for women and minorities or for attention to issues of gender, race, and class. These silences and exclusions in Burns' treatise are powerful teachers of a privileged view of leadership.

The exclusion extends as Burns' develops a universal perspective of the transformational leader. Although he introduces transformational leadership as a relational concept, suggesting that leadership occurs when "persons engage with one another in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (p. 20), he describes the transformational leader using language that accentuates dominance. Burns theorizes that transformational leaders reach the highest stages of moral, intellectual, and personal development. He describes these leaders as omniscient; one who does for and to "his" followers; one who exposes followers to broader values by refining their aspirations and gratifications; and one who gratifies followers' lower needs so that higher motivations will arise. His perspective includes leaders being "more skillful," of having to take the "major role" in action, and "allowing" links of communication. He states:

> . . . leaders hold enhanced influence at the higher levels of the need and value hierarchies. They can appeal to the more widely and deeply held values, such as justice, liberty, and brotherhood. . . . . Most important, they can gratify lower needs so that higher motivations will arise to elevate the conscience of men and women. (p.43)

Burns' ideas currently influence many scholars who use his male-dominated perspective to develop their version of a quality leader. However we noticed that in his treatise on leadership (which won a Pulitzer Prize), Burns totally overlooks the contributions of Mary Parker Follett who, in the 1920s, used almost identical terms to describe transforming leaders.[5] The female perspective, Follett's version of "leadership

---

[5] Follett's earliest contributions were lectures delivered to businessmen between 1925 and 1932. These lectures were first published in an edited text by Metcalf and Urwick (1942). Her reference to transforming leadership is found in the lecture titled "The Essentials of Leadership" (1987, p. 52).

and followership", of "power with" instead of "power over," of "relational" concepts rather than "hierarchies" is never cited in Burns' text.

Although Follett is often credited by organizational theoriests as being the first writer to present a comprehensive theoretical view of administration of the modern organization (Fleming, 1982; Sergiovanni, 1992), her theory on leading is rarely mentioned or given more than a passing glance in educational leadership texts. Drucker (1958) credited her with being the "most quoted, but least heeded of all students of organizations" (p.8) and Sergiovanni, (1992) described her perspectives as "quite advanced for the time", but most scholars quickly move on to credit traditional and privileged white males as more influential in the development of leadership theory. To this point, we cannot locate an author of leadership texts who acknowledges that this is a socially constructed and consciously perpetuated viewpoint, an example of Bourdieu's (1977) "meconnaissance." In other words, the power to name, the privileged perspective belongs to Burns. The perpetuation of this privileged view about who has defined leadership continues to govern and define the views of women and men. The silence about diverse perspectives in theory and practice is also a choice made by academics who write and teach texts.

Today, some writers depict transformational leadership as a "feminine" perspective that is emerging to play a revitalizing role in organizations of the 1990s (Rosener 1990, Torbert, 1991). These writers suggest that transformational leadership encompasses many of the characteristics normally attributed to feminine leadership styles. In fact many authors, following Burns' prediction, suggest that the organizational movement towards transformational leadership opens doors of opportunity for women leaders to establish themselves as management insiders. We wonder if this is indeed the dawning of a golden age of opportunity for women, or if the rise of transformational leadership is an act of appropriation by the dominant leadership culture? Rosener (1991) notes that until recently, attributes traditionally associated with women (i.e., intuition, consensus building, encouraging participation) were seen as ineffective in traditional hierarchical organizations. Why would these attributes now become desirable? If we take the position of the outsider looking in, another perspective on this issue becomes visible. A careful review of the literature on transformational leadership reveals that it is written primarily by men, for men. As the characteristics are described through the concepts and terms of the dominant discourse they become genderless and are merged into a universal and privileged perspective.

Theoretical Frames for Leadership

Another example of a text perpetuating deeply embedded assumptions of privilege is Lee Bolman and Terence Deal's Reframing Organizations (1991), a recently updated text on organizational theory. Describing the increasing importance of leadership behaviors for managers, they work from the premise that "we need leaders and managers who appreciate that management is a deeply moral and ethical undertaking" (p. xiv). Bolman and Deal use a wide array of organizational theories to develop "multiple lenses" (p. xv) or what they call "frames" that help leaders to see and understand more about their choices if they apply the logic of the frames. The major drawbacks of the text are that the four frames represent traditional perspectives of leading, typical examples of the frames in action come from a white-male, corporate, or sports world. Gendered examples for their frames frequently are stereotypes. The most critical drawback of this leadership text is that illustrations that could expand perspectives about diversity and equity are universalized, alienated, and decontextualized in ways that repress learning.

A key example of alienation reinforcing a privileged viewpoint is found in the chapter on interpersonal relationships and group dynamics. A case study details the interactions among a Hispanic female who is labeled by a new colleague as "the affirmative action candidate" (p. 132), an older male colleague described as "a good old boy", and a man described as their joint boss. Although Bolman and Deal acknowledge that the case demonstrates gender and sexual dynamics, they counter by citing research about the significant personal costs women pay when confronting bias issues. They then redirect the entire confrontation through their human resource frame and give examples for developing interpersonal competence. The majority of their solutions are directed specifically at changing the behavior of the minority woman. No suggestions or examples are given for the offending "good old boy" or the man who supervises both employees. Nothing in Bolman and Deal's analysis of this scenario suggests that the fundamental moral and ethical standards of the men in this organization are at issue.

Lee Bolman and Terence Deal are respected researchers and educators; their work is frequently used to educate business managers and school administrators. They state in their concluding chapter: "Leaders need to be deeply reflective, actively thoughtful, and dramatically explicit about their core values and beliefs" (p. 449). Despite the fact that their fourth frame focuses on meaning management, their description of the symbolic frame does not examine the deeply embedded meanings that dominate and control the lives of many men and women in organizations. Yet their own core values and beliefs do not result in thoughtful attention to the dynamic issues of diversity that confront leaders in organizations.

Silences in Educational Leadership Literature

Theories of leadership thread their way into practice through textbooks that introduce prospective school leaders to educational administration, through texts that inform professors of educational administration, and through the texts found in professional journals. We used our practitioner and our academic experience in K-12 and higher education administration to locate the practices of privilege in teaching, learning, and school culture. To identify the embedded assumptions of privilege in the current literature, we reviewed (1) textbooks used in educational leadership programs; (2) texts for professors of educational leadership; (3) a leadership knowledge and skill base from the National Policy Board for Educational Administration; and (4) selected professional journals for school administrators and academics in educational leadership programs. The data not only support Kempner's (1991) "no problem" conclusions, they demonstrate the deafening silence of the discussion about diversity and equity throughout the education and professional development of school leaders.

Textbooks

A review of educational divisions of major publishing houses found few, if any, texts on leadership, the principalship, the superintendency, the professoriate, or educational administration written by women or other marginalized groups. Those written by women tend to focus on women. Using Tetreault's (1989) analysis of curriculum we found that most current educational leadership texts are blatant examples of the "add and stir approach" or the limited perspectives and silences referred to by Griffeths (1991). Those few texts that include content about women, equity, or diversity include a special chapter on women and minorities which tends to highlight their inclusion as problematic. Authors occasionally include a credible discussion of the statistics and issues of workplace equity and diversity and discuss the challenges faced by marginalized groups in educational administration. Increasingly, authors cite the extensive research conducted by Charol Shakeshaft on women in administration, and point out the need for a variety of perspectives in a preparatory curriculum. The chapter, if included, typically is located at the end of the book. (For examples see Kowalski & Reitzug, 1992); Lunenberg & Ornstein, 1991) Unfortunately, the remaining content of these introductory texts reflects a traditional privileged perspective of leading schools with no attention to voices that have traditionally been silenced or marginalized. Ironically, the text by Theodore Kowalski and Ulrich Reitzug (1993) concludes with the following charge from the authors:

> American public schools remain a primary force for creating opportunity in a diverse society. As such, those who lead these institutions should be committed to fairness and equal opportunity. . . . This worthy objective is made more difficult when existing conditions indirectly tell minorities and females that equality is merely a myth. (p. 343)

The myth of equality is reinforced in most classrooms where current texts for educating school leaders reinforce a dominant and privileged view of who can lead.

We located very few introductory texts which weave the research and experience of marginalized groups throughout the content. One introductory text for school administration (Sergiovanni, Burlingame, Coombs, & Thurston, 1992) intermingles the work of several women, but makes no attempt to balance or recenter the total perspective of their text.[6] We found only one example of a recentered viewpoint in a text edited by Capper (1993); authors, content, and theories come from many perspectives, bringing forward a complex conversation about diversity and equity for school leaders. The opportunity for prospective school leaders to learn about and reflect on diverse and equitable perspectives about leading is almost nonexistent; the privileged perspective, for the most part, prevails.

Texts for Professors of Educational Leadership

Several current texts written for academics focus on methods, theories, and programs for educating school leaders that challenge this privileged view (Foster, 1986; Murphy, 1992; Shakeshaft, 1989). For instance, according Foster (1986) university teaching should promote praxis: a model of learning behavior that can transfer to action in schools. He promotes a collaborative debate about what leadership stands for as a way of giving ourselves a chance to see the myths, rituals, and symbols that lead to actions that foster inequity and injustice. Foster's viewpoint reflects Dewey's (1916) perspective on the relationship between democratic practices inside schools and democratic behaviors outside of schools. He encourages academic scholars to take their classroom experience directly to the school site and attempt to ask better quetions about actions: questions like, Who benefits?, and Who suffers? His viewpoint also supports our contention that academic scholars must become conscious of how their words and actions in classrooms

---

6 Sergiovanni, Burlingame, Coombs, & Thurston (1992) achieves what Tetreault (1988) calls stage three or a "bifocal curriculum," intermingling the work of women like Mary Parker Follett, the perspectives of Ella Flagg Young, and the research of and about women in several chapters. The authors go far beyond just stating the importance of equity, but they still do not choose to address the gender balance or recenter the total perspective of their text.

translate to words and actions in schools. The scholars and practitioners must locate how the words and actions empower, oppress, or as we assert, sustain privilege.

Foster's work provides yet another insight about the difficulty educators face when challenging privileged viewpoints. Even as he presents an alternative view for the education of school leaders, Foster still draws exclusively from traditional and privileged male leadership theories to frame his discussion. It is one thing to promote a new lens, but as educators of leaders, if we refuse to accept the challenge of applying new lenses to our own work, the point is lost and the value diminished.

Feminist bell hooks, (1990), acknowledges the difficulty we face with expanding a privileged view. She suggests that "the extent to which knowledge is made available, accessible, etc. depends on the nature of one's political commitments" (p. 30-31). She reminds us, "It is necessary to remember that it is first the potential oppressor within that we must rescue--otherwise we cannot hope for an end to domination, for liberation" (1989, p. 21).

Silences in the Knowledge Base

The selection and use of text is the responsibility of academics who educate and certify school administrator. Following hook's premise that challenging our own embedded assumptions is necessary to end forms of privilege or domination, we approached a new curriculum document published by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration with high hopes.

A curriculum document in a 4 inch binder prepared by 102 participants across all educational agencies is hard to dismiss. The weight alone suggests status. This document entitled "Principals for Our Changing Schools" (1993), was a collaborative effort of scholars and practitioners who committed to "recast the preparation programs for the principalship into a more contemporary mold" (p. xii). The "essential knowledge and skills (p. xiii) for learning about the principalship is presented in 21 domains, which the authors point out, are overlapping and convergent when related to specific tasks. Stating at the outset that the current practice of educating school leaders with methods and concepts from a variety of other disciplines does not provide focus and meaning for practitioners, the participants in this design project attempted to create a new direction for professional preparation programs. The preface states:

> the preparation of school leaders should focus on the development of a broadly applicable knowledge and skills base that is timeless and that emphasizes knowledge and skill development rather that particular problems of practice. (p. xi)

and

> One clear outcome of this process was the emergence of professional skills--in addition to content knowledge--as essential to a successful principalship. The professional repertoire of principals requires knowing how to act as well as simply knowing about concepts. (xii)

Our critique of this 3 year effort, based on the application of a feminist lens, is not positive. Because the document is introduced as a "new" knowledge and skill base "essential" for the education of successful leaders, we hoped to locate visible attention to emergent issues of equity, diversity, and justice in all 21 domains. Contradicting the premise of the project, the document is a traditional privileged perspective of the knowledge, skills, and values that has governed the practice of school administrators for 50 years. Only one domain, that dealing with the philosophy and culture, deliberately incorporates multiple lenses for examining the role of education in a democratic society. We were struck by the obvious lack of application of the multiple lenses to all the other strands in the proposed knowledge base.

Glaring examples of exclusion and pseudo-inclusion were found in several of the domains. For example, the leadership domain decontextualizes all theories, continuing the embedded assumption that all theories apply neutrally to all people. The domain does include extensive discussion of the principal's role in bringing congruence between values espoused and values in action in school policies and procedures. Attention is given to collaborative efforts, consensus building, and high standards. But to illustrate how "understanding one's beliefs and motivation, and receiving objective feedback are cornerstones of leadership development" (p. 1-13), an exercise using a "values worksheet" (p. 1-14) is suggested. The values worksheet is a list of 25 values that trainers are encouraged to apply to "real-life leadership situations" (p. 1-13). Some of the values listed include achievement, advancement, authority, autonomy, financial success, order, recognition, and winning. The list totally excludes the values of equity, diversity, tolerance or respect. For women and men leaders, this list of values instructs acceptable, indeed prized, beliefs about leading. For women and minorities this list of values presents an immense fault line.

Two domains that focus on communication contain flagrant examples of pseudo-inclusion. The domain of interpersonal sensitivity includes a stereotyping exercise that pointedly identifies negative responses only toward women. Advise to principals for dealing with ethnic and cultural stereotypes assumes that a principal is not of an ethnic origin that might value non-majority behaviors. This is particularly visible in the knowledge domain for oral and nonverbal expression which include one short paragraph on "cultural and gender bias differences" (p. 16-13). Information on eye contact in

communication reminds the principal that some cultures, such as Native Americans, do not value eye contact. There appears to be an assumption that the Native American would not be a principal. Each of these sections gives minimal attention to specific information on communication issues governed by gender, race, and class. References in each section show little attention to specific and critical work in this field. Professional educators of school leaders are invited to note a 3-page "add and stir" reference list devoted specifically to cultural and gender issues. The list apparently is intended to alleviate challenging communication issues for school leaders. It was interesting to note that the well-known works of academic colleagues such as Carol Gilligan, Mary Belenky, James Banks, Carl Grant, and Christine Sleeter were not included in this reference list. Based on the premise that these domains represent "essential" knowledge and skills, we contend that the exclusion of diverse perspectives is inexcusable.

Silences in Professional Journals

Practitioners in school administration, both in K-12 schools and higher education continue their education by participating in various professional organizations. Those organizations, via their publications, also contribute to the praxis of educational leadership. To gain insight into the social construction of ongoing praxis related to diversity and equity, we examined the professional discourse of eight major educational journals. The examined journals included The School Administrator published by the American Association of School Administrators, Principal published by the National Association of Elementary Principals, The NASSP Journal published by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Educational Leadership, published by The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Kappan, published by the Phi Delta Kappa honorary society, and The Executive Educator published by The National School Boards Association.

To locate evidence of privileged assumptions in the professional conversation, we conducted an ERIC search between 1983 and 1992 using the terms of "equity", "diversity", "gender", "multicultural", women", women's, "female", females, affirmative action and "sex equity". The over-30,000 references identified were further limited by searching the specific journal titles. The remaining references were verified by searching bound editions of a random selection of years for each journal. Only major articles were included in the final reference list; editorials, commentaries, and essays were eliminated. The findings are devastating.

Drawing from perspectives of privilege discussed by Thiele (1987), McIntosh (1988), and Tetreault (1989), we categorized articles by the degree to which the content

challenged traditional, universal, and essentialist viewpoints. In the data analyses shown on Table 1.1, "total articles identified by the search" means major articles. We did not include editorials, commentaries, and essays in the analysis. Articles from all journals identified as "challenging a privileged view" contained a gender-balanced view, diverse voices and perspectives, and encouraged rethinking traditional and privileged views. An example of this type of article found in The School Administrator (Holmes, 1991) dealt with sex equity. The author included interview data from administrators who openly discussed the "no problem" and "trivial issue" perspective they confront when trying to address equity issues in academics and athletics. In addition, the author garnered specific practical examples for changing behaviors, policies, and attitudes from school leaders who are committed to advancing equity issues.

Table 1.1: Privileged Viewpoints in 10 Years of Professional Journals[7]

Journal	Articles identified by search	Challenge to Privileged View	Limited Challenge to Privileged View	No Challenge to Privileged View
School Administrator	27	5	13	9
Executive Educator	31	8	8	15
Educational Leadership	56	16	18	22
Principal	18	1	7	10
NASSP Journal	37	8	15	14
Kappan	70	31	23	18

Articles designated as a "limited challenge to privileged perspectives" typically included some attention to difference and diversity. Examples include articles with statistics on changing demographics in school administration with some notice of increasing numbers of women and minorities in the principalship. Frequently, the articles ascribed to this category addressed an issue related to diversity and equity but lacked an in-depth analysis of the issues, contained a one-sided analysis of the issue based on a privileged perspective, or included comments or titles that detracted from or changed perceptions of the issue. An example of this modified perspective was found in an article in Principal that examined gender differences among principals. The article is subtitled, "Recent studies seem to indicate that a woman's place is in the elementary principalship."

---

7 Although the Kappan and Educational Leadership have substantially more identified articles that the other journals, it should be noted that generally these journal include more feature articles in each issue than the other journals and also use a thematic approach to their issues. Each of these journals has dedicated an entire issue the discussion of diversity and equity in recent years These issues tend to include more attention to ideas that bring some challenge to a privileged viewpoint. However, it should be noted that no journal makes a consistent attempt to foster this discussion.

(Andrews & Basom, 1990). The authors noted that women in administration have the ability to be strong instructional leaders and, indeed, outdistance male colleagues in perceived success as instructional leaders. However, the authors make no reference to the information in the subtitle-that a woman's place is in the elementary principalship. Yet within one brief subtitle, women were defined and confined to one position within the administrative structure.

Articles designated as bringing "no challenge to the privileged perspective" avoided any discussion of gender, equity, diversity, and ethnicity, even when the content warranted this viewpoint. For instance, in the March, 1987, issue of Principal an article on situational leadership theory and its specific application to the tasks of the elementary principal avoided all discussion of gender differences and was accompanied by photos of men (Blanchard, Zagarmi, & Zagarmi, p. 13). The article that followed discussed the power of learning about leadership from corporate management texts and prominently featured a photo of a woman (Snyder & Anderson, p. 22). The reader can conclude from these articles and photos that women who wish to become successful school leaders must learn expertise from white-male corporate models. Male school leaders, on the other hand, already have the knowledge and expertise to adapt their leadership to many situations. The silences and photos are subtle, but very powerful, messages that embed privileged values, attitudes, and behaviors in the daily practice of school leaders.

The total number of articles for each journal during the ten-year period clearly illustrates the limited conversation about diversity and equity among practicing professionals. For instance, Principal, a journal directed at elementary principals, published only 18 articles that addressed any issues about diversity and equity during the entire decade; only 2 of those articles focused on leadership access for women or minorities. With such a limited conversation, we can hardly be surprised that words and actions related to diversity and equity are equally limited.

The NASSP Journal, directed at secondary administrators, published 37 articles during the decade. Even though access is a critical issue for women at this level of administration, no attention has been given to the subject since 1986. Between 1983 and 1986, 6 articles focused on race and gender issues in the secondary principalship, but since that time the journal is contributing to Kempner's (1991) conclusion of "no problem". Although the number of articles that focus on diversity appears to be increasing (6 in 1992), all the content is directed to curriculum, students, or finance issues.

Again, it becomes very clear why school leaders respond to questions about diversity issues with "no problem." The call issued by Kowalski and Reitzug (1993) for

leaders to be committed to fairness and equal opportunity is answered by a privileged silence in their professional journals.

Conclusion

When Dewey proposed an educational system that openly addresses social relationships, a system that fosters personal interest in issues of equity and diversity, he challenged educators to model "habits of mind" that teach open-mindedness. Our review of the theories and praxis of school leadership using lenses that expose privilege and embedded notions leads us to conclude that if we are to achieve the system that Dewey challenged us to develop, we must construct a more inclusive ideology. For that to occur, scholars and educators of leaders must acknowledge that the organization of our current way of knowing about leadership is privileged and essentialist in nature.

We are not proposing the eradication of the current ideology, but we do take the positon that what we have come to "know" about leadership through this narrowly constructed lens is privileged and lacks breadth and openmindedness. Educators represent a unique point of access to the society and for the society. Through the process of education at all levels we learn not only which values are accepted and held dear, we also learn which values are viewed as complex or not viewed at all. For many educators, the silences, the invisibility, the contradictions are very real experiences that speak loudly about academic commitments to diversity and equity in school leadership. To achieve a balanced education about leadership that constructs an inner eye capable of seeing embedded assumptions about leading, our rethinking must include more diverse examples of leaders and the work of people from many perspectives. The study of leadership must include a multiplicity of perspectives if we are to understand how the deeply embedded assumption of privilege constrain the conversation about diversity and equity.

The response to Dewey's call to model openmindedness means to juxtapose voices of men and women, voices of traditional authority and marginalized perspectives, voices of privileged Western culture and worldwide viewpoints, and voices of leadership discourse and personal standpoint. Academics and practitioners must behave as models of learners, reconstructing their professional conversation so it consistently and openly addresses privileged practices. hook's (1989) suggests we document and share work that communicates how individuals confront differences constructively and successfully. The dialogue emerging from this type of learning experience has the potential to construct a different ideology of leadership, an ideology that includes all voices.

Our review of the theories and praxis of school leadership is not complete without acknowledgement of our personal journey to examine the construction of our own "inner

eye" (Anderson, 1990). Our research includes personally painful learning experienced as we confronted our own fundamental value structures, our own embedded assumptions of privilege (Rusch, Gosetti, & Mohoric, 1991). Our research was also guided by the observations of the painful learning experienced by others as they became aware of or struggled with their privilege. As a result, we conclude, along with hooks (1990), that confronting the socially constructed oppressor within is a critical key to achieving new levels of awareness about diversity and equity.

REFERENCES

Anderson, G. L. (1990). Toward a critical constructivist approach to school administration: Invisibility, legitimation, and the study of non-events. Educational Administration Quarterly, 6(1), 38-59.

Andrews, R. &. Basom, M. (1990). Instructional leadership: Are women principals better? Principal, 70(2), 38-40.

Bates, R. (1980). Educational administration: The sociology of science and the management of knowledge. Educational Administration Quarterly, 16,(2), 1-20.

Beck, L., & Murphy, J. (1993) Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical themes 1920s-1990s.

Bennis, W. (1989). On becoming a leader. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: Strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.

Blanchard, K., Zagarmi, D., & Zagarmi, P. (1987). Situational leadership. Principal, 66, (4), 13-16.

Bohmer, S. K. (1989). Resistance to generalizations in the classroom. Feminist Teacher, 4 (2/3), 53-56.

Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1991). Reframing Organizations.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1977). Reproduction in education, society and culture (R. Nice, Trans.). London: SAGE.

Bowers, C. A. (1984). The promise of theory: Education and the politics of cultural change. New York: Longman.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1977). Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life (Paperback ed.). New York: Basic Books.

Burns, J. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Capper, C. A. (Ed.) (1993). Educational administration in a pluralistic society. New York: State University of New York Press.

Cherryholmes, C. (1988). Power and criticism. New York: Teachers College Press.

Collins, P. H. (1991). Learning from the outsider within. In M. M. Fonow, & J. Cook (Eds.), Beyond methodology (pp. 35-39). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York: MacMillan and Co.

Drucker, P. (1958). Technology, management, and society. New York: Harper & Row.

Ferguson, K. (1984). The feminist case against bureaucracy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fine, M., & Weis, L. (1993). Introduction. In L. Weis, & M. Fine (Eds.), Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in United States schools (pp. 1-6). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Fleming, T. (1982) The progressive movement of educational administration from 1920-1950. Unpublished dissertation, University of Oregon.

Follett, M. P. (1987). Freedom and Coordination. New York: Garland. (Originally published in 1949).

Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and Promises. Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books.

Grumet, M. (1988). Bitter milk. Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Harding, S. (1991). Whose science? Whose knowledge? Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.

Harragan, B. L. (1977). Games mother never taught you. New York: Warner Books.

Hennig, M., & Jardim, A. (1977). The managerial woman. New York: Pocket Books.

Holmes, N. C. (1991). The road less traveled by girls. School Administrator, 48(10), 11-20.

hooks, b. (1989). Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black. Boston: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1990). Yearning: Race, gender and cultural politics. Boston, MA: South End Press.

House, E. R. (1983). How we think about evaluation. In E. R. House (Ed.), Philosophy of Education (pp. 5-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hoyle, J. R. (1989). Preparing the 21st century superintendent. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(5), 376-9.

Kempner, K. (1991). Getting into the castle of educational administration. Peabody Journal of Education, 104-123.

Kowalski, T., & Reitzug, U. (1993). Contemporary school administration. New York: Longman.

Lenski, G. E. (1966). Power and privilege: A theory of social stratification. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lunenburg, F., & Ornstein, A. (1991). Educational administration: Concepts and practices. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. Working paper no. 189, Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women, Wellesley, MA.

Mahar, C.,Harker, R., & Wilkes, C. (1990). The basic theoretical position. In R. Harker,C. Mahar, & C. Wilkes (Eds.), An introduction to the work of Pierre Bourdieu: The practice of theory (pp. 1-25). London: MacMillan.

Metcalfe, H., & Urwick, L. (Eds.). (1942). Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Meyer, J. (1991). Power and love: Conflicting conceptual schemata. In K. Davis,M. Leijenaar, & J. Oldersma (Eds.), The gender of power (pp. 21-41). London: SAGE.

Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Velsor, E. V. (1987). Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations?. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Murphy, J. (1990). Preparing school administrators for the twenty-first century: The reform agenda. In B. M. &. L. Cunningham (Eds.), Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities, and schools: 89th yearbook of the national society for the study of education (pp. 232-251). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Murphy, J. (1992). The landscape of leadership preparation: Reframing the education of school administrators. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (Eds.). (1987). Approaches to administrative training in education. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1992). Principals for our changing schools: Knowledge and skills base. Washington, DC: Author.

Quantz, R. A.,Rogers, J., & Dantley, M. (1991). Rethinking transformative leadership: Toward democratic reform of schools. , 173(3), 96-118.

Peters, T., & Austin, N. (1985). A passion for excellence: The leadership difference. New York: Random House.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman Jr., R. H. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies. New York: Harper & Row.

Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. Harvard Business Review, 68 (6), 119-125.

Rosener, J. B. (1991). Ways men and women lead - debate. Harvard Business Review, 69 (1), 150-160.

Rusch, E. A., Gosetti, P. P., & Mohoric, M. (1991, November). The social construction of leadership: Theory to praxis. 17th annual conference on Research on Women in Education, sponsored by the American Educational Research Association, San Jose, CA.

Sergiovanni, T. (1990). Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Sergiovanni, T., Burlingame, M., Coombs, F., & Thurston, P. (1992). Educational governance and administration. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Shakeshaft, C. (1989). Women in educational administration. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin

Sleeter, C. (1993). Power and privilege in white middle-class feminist discussions of gender and education. In S. K. Biklen & D. Pollard (Eds.), Gender and Education Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smith, D. E. (1987). The everyday world as problematic. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Snyder, K. & Anderson, R. (1987). What principals learn from corporate management. Principal, 66(4), 22-26.

Spelman, E. V. (1988). Inessential woman: Problems of exclusion in feminist thought. Boston: Beacon Press.

Tetreault, M. K. (1989). Integrating content about women and gender into the curriculum. In J. Banks, & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives (pp. 124-144). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Thiele, B. (1987). Vanishing acts in social and political thought: Tricks of the trade. In C. Pateman, & E. Gross (Eds.), Feminist challenges: Social and political theory (pp. 30-43). Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Torbert, W. R. (1991). The power of balance: Transforming self, society, and scientific inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.